

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 and 22-39 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 11 and 24 have been amended. No new claims have been added and no claims have been canceled. Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in view of the above made amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

I. Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 8-14, 18-21, 23-27 and 31-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,035,121 to Chiu et al. (hereinafter “Chiu”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0126559 to Fuhrmann (hereinafter “Fuhrmann”), and rejected claims 5-7, 15-17 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiu in view of Fuhrmann and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,659,753 to Murphy et al. (hereinafter “Murphy”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to amended claims 1, 11 and 24, Applicants’ claimed invention recites in amended claim 1, for example, performing said migration based on a module-type migration and based on said stored information to a stored length to provide a path backwards to reestablish the stored length using pre-migration information including:

a user-related setting string;

at least one system-wide setting string, with each user-related or system wide setting string allowing a registry value association between said stored migration information and a stored registry in an automatically generated string table;

wherein said migration information can compare a file name with said stored registry, to said automatically generated string table; and

performing said migration based on said stored migration information to a stored registry to synchronize the post-migration system structure.

That is to say, that Applicants’ claimed invention employs a stored link using pre-migration information with a user-related setting string and at least one system-wide setting string. Furthermore, the aforementioned setting strings allow a registry value association between said stored migration information and a stored registry in an automatically generated string table. As such, the claimed invention employs *inter alia* a system conversion and updating

process that may be separated into multiple layers, further including multiple components or modules that may be used for different types of localized data, and as previously asserted, for instance, registry entries as opposed to shell folder objects. This modular-type approach is shown, for example, in step 4 or 5 of Figure 4. In addition, the localization table generation which direct migration information is also shown in more detail in Figure 3B, and is indicated by 302, and 304, respectively. The migration information 304 also feeds into 301 the user-run cross language upgrade shown in Figure 3B and indicated in more detail to further include element 306 which is indicated as the migration tool.

Clearly contrary to the layered modularity contained at the local system of the instant invention, it appears that Chiu creates a non-localized distribution to a localization vendor for translation. See, for example, Chiu, Column 3, lines 14-18. Clearly, the translation tool operates externally from the local system, since the information is necessarily distributed to an external vendor. In addition, the Examiner has made numerous attempts to incorporate Chiu for its discussions concerning programs, such as Microsoft Corporation Windows to provide various services to programs via dynamic link library (DLL) to link and share system functionality. Although it is not disputable, that there may be some discussion of executable object code, in the Chiu reference directed to particular dynamic link libraries 14 it appears that while a dynamic link library may be discussed, the particular discussion involves a non-localized, that is distributed, vendor for translation. Insofar as the discussion of Chiu continues, there is a glaring disconnect in the discussion and description of Chiu, as evidenced by the poorly edited and disclosed description to accompany Figure 2.

Chiu discloses a flow chart of a system for localizing a program according to the invention. However, as clearly indicated in column 4, the paragraph beginning at line 35, the drafter of the Chiu application never removed a parenthetical editing remark that states "a block diagram showing operation of a leverage tool would be helpful". As such, Applicants are left to wonder whether or not the instant reference is sufficiently supported by the written description and figures which did accompany the application into publication, or for that matter, whether the

block diagram that is shown in Figure 2 is properly correlated with the language contained within the Specification.

Accordingly, with the level of specificity required to fully understand the application of the instant invention in light of the limitations currently in discussion, and as relating to the leverage tool of Chiu, it appears that the leverage tool as applied by the Examiner in Chiu appears to fail to at least teach, disclose or suggest all of the relevant elements heretofore compared against the instant claim set. Clearly, in light of the above mentioned amendments, fall far short in sufficient detail to provide Applicants' representative with sufficient data to adequately compare the specificity by which the current claimed invention requires. That is to say that Applicants believe that the Examiner would also be hard pressed to reasonably apply Chiu in the current convention, and accordingly suggest that a new reference should be applied to replace the deficiencies found within Chiu.

Therefore, although the Examiner has attempted to combine Chiu with Fuhrmann, the direct rejection of independent claims 1, 11 and 24, for example, the Examiner cannot rely upon Chiu to provide the depth of detail by which one of ordinary skill in the art would need to rely upon in order to make a *prima facie* case rejection with regards to the instant claimed invention, and especially in regards to render any of the new features unpatentable with regards to independent claims 1, 11 and 24.

Insofar as claims 2-4, 8-10, 12-14, 18-21, 23-27 and 31-39 depend directly from independent claims 1, 11 and 24, respectively, Applicants assert that these claims are also not rendered obvious by the asserted combination of Chiu in view of Fuhrmann for at least the same reasons recited above, as well as for the additional recitations contained therein.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 8-14, 18-21, 23-27 and 31-39 under § 103 over the combination of Chiu in view of Fuhrmann.

With regards to the claims 5-7, 15-17 and 28-30, which are rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Chiu in view of Fuhmann and further in view of Murphy, Applicants respectfully assert that for at least the same reasons recited above with regards to the independent claims 1, 11 and 24, which claims 5-7, 15-17 and 28-30 depend from, claims 5-7, 15-17 and 28-30 are similarly not rendered obvious in view of the combinations of Chiu, Fuhmann and Murphy since Murphy fails to provide what is lacking with regards to Chiu and Fuhmann. As such, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 5-7, 15-17 and 28-30 under § 103 over the combination of Chiu, Fuhmann and Murphy.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact William D. Titcomb Reg. No. 46,463 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 25, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

46463

WILLIAM D. TITCOMB